2

Military & Industrial War

and the

Science of Organisation.

By M. BRUCE-WILLIAMS.

F SURGEONS OF ENGLAND
2 JAN 13
LIBRARY

London, 1912
Association of Standardised
Knowledge, Ltd.,
15-16 Buckingham St., Adelphi.

Military and Industrial War

AND THE

Science of Organisation.

By

M. BRUCE-WILLIAMS.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF ENGLAND
-2 JAN 15
LIBRARY

LONDON, 1912
THE ASSOCIATION OF STANDARDISED
KNOWLEDGE, LIMITED,
15-16 Buckingham Street, Adelphi, W.C.

MILITARY AND INDUSTRIAL WAR
AND THE
SCIENCE OF ORGANISATION.

When men first discovered, in the 19th Century, that there were laws governing the Evolution of Society, they were inclined, in the presence of so powerful an authority as Nature, to say "These laws will take care of us, and the best thing that we can do is to allow ourselves to move in the direction in which they may carry us." The Manchester School became identified with this line of thought.

The writings of Carlyle and others were a protest against the insanity of adopting such a helpless position, which, it was pointed out by them, would lead us into anarchy. A re-action from the bad results of this school of thought has now set in, and it has become obvious to everybody that Nature is so profoundly indifferent to our special interests—is so impartial in the way in which she allows all life to struggle blindly for existence—that man must take control, within certain well-defined limits, of the laws which he finds govern the Evolution of Society, and direct them in the direction of his own special welfare, order and interest.

No business manager, for instance, in practice ever allows his business to drift along, but organises it with as much energy and power as he can, and we now see that, as Carlyle long ago pointed out, organising captains of industry are needed to prevent the nation drifting "Niagara-wards."

The service that great captains in war rendered to Feudalism is, in fact, now required by modern industrial civilisations from the great captains of industry, and when we say that the Organisation Society proposes to show how to turn the Lines of Least Resistance—the drift of Evolutionary laws—into Lines of Greatest Efficiency, we mean that it undertakes to show Captains of Industry and Social Reformers the Principles of sound Organisation, to illustrate these Principles by practical examples drawn from industrial and military life, and to advocate the teaching of these Principles by every possible means, so that the general standard of Organisation, private and public, in the country may be raised.

Industrial War differs from Military War in the fact that the Industrial Chief is always at war, whereas the Military Chief is only at war occasionally. Just as a Military man has a battle to win before he can enter the enemy's City, so the Industrial Captain has a battle to win before he can capture a Market. To capture the enemy's Capital in Military War usually puts an end to the War, but the capture of a Market by an Industrial Chief means that he must re-double his energy and maintain himself in war condition of Industrial Efficiency to maintain his capture.

The long period of Peace that often intervenes between two wars allows Military machinery gradually to become less efficient than it was at the close of the first war, the principles of War being, if the peace is long enough, subtly transposed into Red Tape Rules at the War Office and a study of the Theory without the Practice of War at the Military School.

In Industrial War, this long period of Peace never takes place, but something almost as dangerous to Efficiency in Industrial War *does* arise, and that is the Confidence of Security. "Security" Shakespeare says, "is man's chiefest enemy," and many an industrial house, after a brilliant success, has failed ultimately because its officials became lapped in Security, and the principles upon which the organisation was first moulded become, as in Military War, Red Tape Rules of the Office.

Military War.

Both Industrial and Military Chiefs in each case have forgotten one essential factor, and that is the constant change of the conditions under which Military and Industrial Campaigns are fought. Between one war and another, an enormous change has taken place—if the interval is long enough—in all the tactical details of battle. The Principles remain always the same, the Weapons and Tactical considerations change. The Geography of the Country in which the first war was waged is quite different to the Geography of the Country in which the second war is waged. The Social conditions that obtained at the time of the first war are quite different to the Social conditions that obtain at the time of the second war. Behind the first war may be a strong political party dominated by an Aristocratic figure, a great Power; behind the second war may be a strong Democratic party dominated only by ideas of the expensiveness and waste of war, and the desirability of abolishing Military wars and using the money so saved to mitigate the wastage of human life arising from the conditions of Social Warfare.

When Pericles was in command of the Athenian Social body, the Athenian Generals were uniformly successful:

when one of the partisan parties opposed to his almost autocratic rule was in command of the politics of Athens, the Athenian Generals were almost uniformly unsuccessful.

Industrial War.

In Industrial War it is the same. The conditions of 1890 are not the conditions of 1910. The firm that asserted itself successfully in 1890, unless it has kept itself thoroughly up-to-date, is very likely to be a long way on the down grade in 1910. If a firm is not alive to the constantly changing tactical applications of the Science of Business required by the varying conditions of Industrial War, the character of the Markets to be conquered, the changes in Education and Taste, etc., of the people to be provided with goods, and the thousand-and-one details of Industrial Strife, then it may be taken for granted that the initial insight into the Principles of the Science of Industrial War have been lost sight of by sleepy officials and are known only as Red Tape Rules.

Is there a Science of Industry ? Is there a Science of Military War? Many soldiers deny that there is such a Science. Many Industrial Chiefs will deny that there is such a Science.

In the case of Military War, it cannot be said that there has been any *conscious* knowledge of such a Science until quite recent date. The school formed in France for the study of the Psychology of Napoleon does seem, however, to have extracted from a study of his campaigns certain definite laws or rules. If these rules are correct, then undoubtedly a Science of War has been evolved. It is probably not too much to say that a study of the campaigns of Cæsar, Hannibal and Alexander would induce an observation of similar rules.

In the days of these great Captains, however, modern Sciences did not exist. To-day we study everywhere the methods of Nature, and as we obtain a knowledge of the general laws that govern her, we speak of a Science in this or in that department of man's knowledge of these laws.

To speak in this way, however, correct as it may seem to the less reflective mind, cannot be said to be as correct as it should be. Bacon says that all true Sciences are based on Axioms and Definitions, and it may be added that these Axioms and Definitions must be capable of being stated in Mathematical terms. It was a perception of this truth that impelled Plato to put over the door of his school " Let none unacquainted with Mathematics enter here."

The reason why all Sciences must have Axioms and Definitions which can be stated in Mathematical terms, is that in a Fluid, Dynamic and Spiritual Universe incessantly changing its appearances and varying in its manifestations, Man must devise instruments of fixed dimensions wherewith to measure and standardise Phenomena. Mathematics is the base of Music, of Chemistry, of Physics, of Architecture, and of all those arts which have a clear and definite Science beneath them, which imply units of measurement, which have definitions in clear language of Principles involved in construction.

Now, the unit of Measurement of the French School which studied the Psychology of Napoleon is the individual French soldier. Napoleon had made a very close study of the psychological strength and weakness of the Frenchman, and his Campaigns were prepared and conducted with as thorough a knowledge of this Psychology as he could get by constant reflection over what he had read in history of French soldiers and the way in which he had seen them influenced in his own Campaigns. Adding to his study of this Unit an instinctive knowledge of the Principles of War, he got the fullest result out of the materials he had at his disposal.

By an instinctive knowledge of the Principles of War, we mean what he meant when he said that "Cæsar had as thorough a knowledge of the Principles of Strategy in his first battle as he did in his last, but that he constantly improved in his tactical management of the battle," improved, that is as an Artist in handling those laws which his own insight revealed to him at the first.

Now, Industrial War in modern times shares with Military War its intimate connection with an age which talks much of Sciences, and one of the most advanced Industrial Nations—the Americans—already speak with confidence of a Science of Industry, and even teach it in some of their Industrial Houses. The Unit that they study is again the Psychology of the Commercial Traveller and the man to whom he has to sell goods. It has again, that is, a Psychological Unit, and the principles are no doubt those which the builder-up of each house has had the insight, as a great organiser, to divine. With an organising brain, he places himself in close touch, by insight, with the lines of Natural Warfare, Industrial or Military.

As yet neither the Science of Industrial or Military Warfare is sufficiently explicit, nor does it correspond to the degree desired with the Principles of Organic Growth in Nature. The success of the Soldier or the Industrial Chief is a personal success, and not a success due to the teaching of a simple

Philosophy or the Principles of a Science of Military or Industrial War based on Mathematical reasoning.

Now, the Science of Organisation is put forward as being such a Science of Organic Growth. It is plain that its principles of Duality and the Lines of Least Resistance are the essential principles of Organic Life—that they are the Lines of Least Resistance of all Dynamic Force, and it is still further claimed that by a conscious use of the Principle of Degree, as dividing all things as good, average and bad, from the point of view of a desired ideal result, this drift of Natural Law is turned to Man's advantage in his struggle for existence, and that the lines of Drift in Nature are so transformed into Lines of Greatest Efficiency for Man.

It is claimed that a Mathematical Statement of these Principles is put forward by the Organisation Society in its Science of Organisation ; it is claimed that it is a Science in the Baconian sense, and not merely called a Science in the loose terminology of a

Semi-Scientific age. And it is further claimed by the Organisation Society that their unit of measurement gives a method of studying the units of Society, not only anatomically and physiologically, but psychologically as well—in other words, a study of the entire unit—and that the device of a Standardised Individual assumed to measure 100 in every function, organ and faculty, does fill the same place in the Science of Sociology and the Art of Statesmanship as similar devices have in Mathematics; in the Axiom of the Point of View; in Perspective, in Chemistry in a Standardised Gas, in Architecture in a Standardised Brick, etc.

Now, it is obvious that in the creation of a pure Science of Organisation which makes explicit the principles upon which Nature herself organises, the principles are applicable to both Military and Industrial War, and can be taught to Students of War and Industry. It is claimed that those principles are only the conscious recognition of the Laws which the instinctive genius of the

Military or Industrial Chief perceives, and that as a Science of Life must raise and standardise War, as a Science of Perspective must raise and standardise the Arts ; so the Science of Organisation must raise and standardise the art and practice of all organisations, whether employed in Military warfare, in the warfare which Society or a Nation wages as a whole, or in a warfare which a section of Society wages—must apply to an Empire as to a Municipality, to a Public department as to a Private business ; and that the main result of its application will be that the Principles of War can no longer be lost sight of because in Military War there is a long interregnum of Peace between two wars, or in Industrial War because there is a period of Security which decreases the activities of the Industrial house. Hence it is obvious that if the Principles of War in the case of an Industrial house are never lost sight of, because always taught in a pure and simple form to Students of Industry, that a far greater degree of initiative and vigour can be steadily maintained in Industrial

War, and that the required constant tactical application of these principles in detail will be maintained, because as a tree dies first at its roots, and then in its leaves and twigs and stems, so the Industrial house dies first at the very roots and springs of its life, that is in the knowledge of the Principles of Industrial War.

This invariably takes place when an Industrial Genius who has founded a big and powerful house dies. A knowledge of those Principles which he saw and applied becomes then more or less a record of Red Tape, and the first sign of this is that the house begins to lose touch with the constantly changing factors and details of the markets it once conquered and now has to retain, or is unable to adjust itself to new markets it desires to conquer. Officials at the Centre may think that the loss of a market here or a market there is of little or no importance to so powerfully established a house as they believe theirs to be, but if they realised that this subtle loss of life in the organisation was due to the fact that the Principles of Industrial Warfare were no longer understood, they might be less easy in their minds.

The value of the Science of Organisation to an Industrial house is that it puts forward and is able to teach Principles that govern Industrial Development so that they can never be lost sight of, being teachable in a plain and explicit form, and consequently the dangerous period when Security becomes their "Chiefest Enemy" may be put off till such time as the heart of their enterprise fails because the Social need for their activities has ceased to exist.

The Organisation Society

FOUNDED 1912

President

*Mr. Marshall Bruce-Williams

Vice-President

*Col. B. R. Ward, R.E.

Hon. Vice-Presidents

Col. E. Aylmer-Jones
Capt. E. D. Carden, R.E.
J. H. Edwards, Esq.
Francis Francis, Esq.
G. Montague Harris, Esq., M.A.
Capt. W. P. H. Hill, R.F.
A. H. H. Matthews, Esq.
*Col. F. N. Maude, C.B.
Lieut.-Gen. Sir Henry H. Settle,
R.E., K.C.B.
George H. Smart, Esq.
Rev. B. W. Stothert, C.F.
Major E. D. Swinton, D.S.O., R.E.

*The above form the Executive Committee.

Communications to be addressed to the Hon. Sec.,
15 and 16 Buckingham Street, London, W.C.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY

1. To define and explain the Science of Organisation, based on the axiom that Society is an extension of the Individual, and on the three principles: of degree, of a universal duality, and of the line of least resistance, and to advocate its application